



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

μόνον"—can hardly be meant seriously. This would be ellipsis with a vengeance. p. 96 D: "On *διά* with acc., where we might expect genitive, see Bigg on Thuc. I 83." I see Bigg and find the futile note that the distinction between *διά* with acc. and *διά* with gen. does not seem to be observed there. Is it necessary to say for the hundredth time that it is never violated, 'owing to' or 'thanks to' covering every case that seems to be an exception? See my note on Justin Martyr, Apol. I, c. 23, II.

A word or two on 74 B: *τί δέ; αὐτὰ τὰ ἴσα ἔστιν ὅτε ἀνισά σοι ἐφάνη ἡ ἡ ἰσότης ἀνισότης*; Dr. Geddes retains *αὐτὰ τὰ ἴσα*, but is evidently dissatisfied, and with reason. If *ἡ* is *aut*, and not *an*, we should inevitably have *αὐτὸ τὸ ἴσον* and not *αὐτὰ τὰ ἴσα*. Schleiermacher felt this, and wrote *αὐτὰ τὰ ἴσα ἔστιν ὅτε ἀνισά σοι ἐφάνη · ἡ ἡ ἰσότης ἀνισότης*; but, as Ast says, we should expect *ταῦτα* (as indicated C: *Ὅν ταῦτ' ὅν ἔστιν, ἡ δ' ὅς, ταῦτα τὰ ἴσα καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἴσον*); and *ταῦτα* would give a satisfactory sense. Mr. Archer-Hind seems to deplore any 'alteration of the text,' but there are worse things than the alteration of the text. The explanation offered by Olympiodoros of *αὐτὰ τὰ ἴσα* is pronounced stuff by Ast, readily accepted by Wagner, set aside by Geddes, who in retaining *αὐτὰ τὰ ἴσα*, says, "It is probable that *αὐτὰ τὰ ἴσα* is plural, as referring to more than one application of the one standard of comparison *αὐτὸ τὸ ἴσον*," whereas Olympiodoros considered it to express "the varying results of the application to different minds," in spite of the personal argument of *σοί*. Stallbaum adduces as a parallel, Parmen. 129 B: *αὐτὰ τὰ ὅμοια*, but I cannot see the appositeness of the parallel, as the Parmenides, on any theory, represents a more advanced stage. Mr. Archer-Hind's note is fuller and more decided, but not more satisfactory, than Dr. Geddes'.

B. L. G.

Studies, Literary and Historical, in the Odes of Horace. By A. W. VERRALL. 196 pp. Macmillan.

The following is a list of the seven essays contained in this volume: (1) Melpomene; (2) Murena; (3) The Historical Poems and the Arrangement of the Three Books; (4) Lamia; (5) Quam Tiberis lavit; (6) Venus and Myrtale; (7) Euterpe.

Of these studies, which are full of interest as well as of novelties for the student of Horace, the most important—certainly the longest, and that which proposes the largest number of new explanations—is the second. If the views here expressed are right, then much in the current exegesis of Horace will have to be changed. Mr. Verrall assumes that the tragic event of the conspiracy and death of Murena gave coloring to, and is often referred to in the first three books of the Odes; therefore, Melpomene is invoked in III 30.

This L. Licinius Varro Murena, brother of Proculeius and brother-in-law of Maecenas, fell heir to the property of M. Terentius Varro, the great scholar and antiquary. To Murena is (as is generally admitted) addressed II 10, and he is referred to by name in III 19, *da'puer auguris Murenæ*; and Sat. I 5, 38, *Murena praebeante domum*. In II 18, *Atfalus* means Varro, and the heir referred to, Murena. Maecenas has divulged the 'secret of the government's knowledge of the conspiracy to Terentia; therefore, III 2, 25, '*est et fidelis silentio merces*,' and II 10, 16, *bene mutuum fidum pectus amoribus*. In III 19, the banquet is supposed to be held at Murena's house at Reate

(cf. *Paelignis frigoribus*); '*lunae novae*' refers to the decoration worn by senators on their shoes, and which the banqueters bring along for Murena, and thus earn their cask of wine. In the *Titanomachia* III 4, Apollo is Tiberius, and the Titans are the conspirators. Finally, this Murena is not the A. Terentius Varro Murena mentioned in the *Fasti* as consul for a short while in the beginning of the year 23, for Dio Cassius says that the conspiracy took place in the year 22. Consequently, the three books cannot have been published in 23, the true date being 19. These are the most important theories brought forth.

Passing over the question of chronology, and of the identity of the man whom all the Latin historians call Varro Murena, or Murena simply, and not Licinius, one is at once impressed with the fact that the theme Murena once set wherever it is only possible, and in cases where it would seem impossible, Horace is supposed to be making reference to it. Especially is this the case in those odes where the connection of thought has been somewhat difficult to see. So, *e. g.*, it is not strange that the ode III 19 should have caused trouble to Mr. Verrall, and made him seek a different explanation from the one generally received; the abrupt change at '*da puer auguris*' is unquestionably difficult. But when as alternative one is asked to look upon *luna nova* as the newly acquired senatorial badge, even when this is defended by II 18, 16, '*novaeque pergunt interire lunae*,' and II 11, 10, '*neque uno luna rubens nitet vultu*,' one naturally hesitates. Without taking *luna* in any other than its ordinary sense, the ode certainly can be explained just as plausibly, and that, too, without supposing the shift of scene. Again, in discussing IV 6, and showing that it cannot be looked upon as a prelude to the *Carmen Saeculare* Apollo is identified with Tiberius, and Achilles with Murena (both gratuitous assumptions, also made in III 4), and the reader is referred to III 19, where '*genus Aeaci*' (Achilles) is paralleled with Murena. That is, '*genus Aeaci*' occurs in what the person addressed is telling about, and Murena (according to Mr. Verrall) in what the poem says he is silent about. But the person addressed is speaking of Inachus and Codrus as well; yet all this shows that Horace couples Achilles with Murena, and Horace's readers remembered it, no doubt, just as they remembered that in III 4 Apollo was Tiberius, and the Titans the conspirators. In exactly the same way the reader of the *Satires* remembered, on reading Ode III 19, *quo praebente domum*, the accidental use of the same phrase with Murena as subject in Sat. I 5, 38, and at once associated the former with Murena too. One might feel tempted to ask how Horace was to have expressed the thought, if he had not been thinking of Sat. I 5, 38 at all. If he constantly has Murena's conspiracy and death before him in the Odes, the poet certainly has been eminently successful in obscuring his true meaning. The third essay attempts to prove that the arrangement of the odes is the historical one; that even if the Odes were not all written in the order in which they occur in our collection, they are consecutive in subject: this shows itself even in the sequence of seasons from ode to ode. Of course, there are seeming exceptions, but these are accounted for. Such are I 3, 24, 29; II 4. In the fourth, the *Lamia* of III 17, '*Aeli vetusto nobilis ab Lamo*,' is supposed to be a slave of Horace's, the same steward to whom is addressed Ep. I 14. The fifth calls attention to the deeper significance of the words '*quam Tiberis lavit*,' in II 2, for the Roman, who knew the danger from inundations. The

sixth treats of the erotic poems and defends Horace, rescuing him from the inconsistency of being both a moral reformer and a libertine; especially is it emphasized that reference is sometimes had to the married state, a fact that seems to have escaped commentators generally. This defense is as it should be; Horace is not so wicked as he has been represented, and in some of those odes in which he hurts our sense of what is morally right, there can be no doubt that it is not Horace who speaks. But then there are places where Horace, as Horace, is to us more than indiscreet, whatever may have been the views of the writer of III 1-6; and even Mr. V. will not assert that all is in good taste. It is, perhaps, as easy to err in trying to defend him as morally good from our standpoint, as in setting him down as a profligate hypocrite. The seventh essay deals with questions of metre, especially the care exhibited by Horace in the treatment of the last syllable of each line, as well as of each stanza.

On the whole, these studies will be read by every student of H. not without profit. They are written in a style that makes them interesting to the reader, even where the subject treated may not be. If one cannot agree with all the views expressed in the first three essays, they are certainly very suggestive, and all of them are of value in the study and proper understanding of the Odes.

EDW. H. SPIEKER.

Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica recensuit HENRICUS SCHENKL. Lipsiae, 1885.

In the preface Schenkl brings forward new grounds for ascribing the *Laus Pisonis* to Calpurnius, and for assuming the date of its composition to have been before that of the *Eclogues*, of which the third, on account of certain metrical peculiarities, may be regarded as the earliest. A careful examination is made of the dependence of Calpurnius on earlier poets, and the manner of his borrowing. Here much discrimination is shown. Some evidence of a direct imitation of Theocritus is adduced, but the possibility of some lost Latin poem forming the medium between Calpurnius and Theocritus is not denied. Of other Greek poets there is little trace of imitation. Vergil and Ovid are extensively copied; Catullus, Horace, Tibullus and Propertius to a much less degree. The correspondences with the latter poet are confined to the fourth book. The *Aetna* and *Culix* were also known to Calpurnius, and small borrowings are noted from Seneca and Petronius; but whether correspondences with Columella, Lucan and Persius are due to borrowing, and which was the borrower in each instance, is less clear. A direct influence of Calpurnius upon Statius is stoutly claimed, Haupt to the contrary notwithstanding.

The art of Nemesianus is next discussed, and some interesting statistics are given of his use of elision. Direct imitation of Theocritus is denied, *Ecl.* IV 21 ff. being drawn rather from Ovid *Ars Am.* II 113 ff., than from Theocritus XXIII 28 ff. Nemesianus is shown to be a more wholesale and clumsy borrower than Calpurnius, often appropriating entire verses with little or no change. Among the poets whom he has plundered are Vergil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid—the *Copa* and *Ciris* and *Carmina Einsiedlensia*—Seneca and Calpurnius.

The sources of the text of these two authors are next examined. The MSS